

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON DIVISION**

**IN RE: AQUEOUS FILM-FORMING
FOAMS PRODUCTS LIABILITY
LITIGATION**

MDL No. 2:18-mn-2873-RMG

**This Document relates to
*City of Stuart, Florida v. 3M Company, et
al., 2:18-cv-03487-RMG***

Before the Court is the Defendants’ motion to seal certain exhibits to their omnibus motion to exclude Plaintiffs’ experts’ opinions, individual motions for summary judgment, and to redact Defendants’ motions to the extent that they refer to those sealed exhibits. (Dkt. No. 2700).

The exhibits at issue have been designated by Plaintiffs or Defendants “Confidential” or “Highly Confidential” under the parties’ protective order. (Dkt. No. 1523). Sealing or redaction is required to comply with the protective order.

Defendants’ Motion to Seal complies with the protocol set forth in Case Management Order No. 17 and provides the notices and opportunity required by the governing law and Local Rule. The Court has reviewed *in camera* the information sought to be sealed. Having weighed the public right of access against competing interests, the Court finds that sealing or redaction are warranted here. Sealing or redaction are furthermore the least drastic method of protecting the information in light of its substance and formatting.

Defendants’ Motion to Seal (Dkt No. 2700) is **GRANTED**. Defendants are directed to file on the docket, under seal, unredacted versions of their motions with accompanying exhibits.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

December 7, 2022
Charleston, South Carolina

s/Richard Mark Gergel
Richard Mark Gergel
United States District Judge